

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/815,323	MCCORMACK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William J Deane	2642	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) William J Deane.

(3) David Brophy.

(2) Bill Lee.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 30, 31 & 02 Sep.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: None.

Identification of prior art discussed: GB 2343081, EP 0987846, US 6526041 and WO 99/34579.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner called Mr. Lee on 30Aug and Mr. Lee scheduled a telephone conference on 31Aug to include Mr. Brophy(Mr. Lee's associate in Ireland). The Examiner called to insure his understanding of the invention and to discuss the prior art referenced above. After the 31 Aug interview, the Examiner called Mr. Lee on 02Sep, to inform him that the Examiner believed that the instant application is allowable over the previously cited and the above cited references. Mr. Lee informed the Examiner that he had again talked with Mr. Brody about the prior art and both agreed that the invention now as claimed was believed to allowable .